SUPREME COURT MINUTES MONDAY, JULY 26, 2010 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S163681 H031540 Sixth Appellate District

SANTA CLARA, COUNTY OF v. S.C. (ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed and remanded.

Majority Opinion by George, C. J.

-- joined by Kennard, Chin, Moreno, & Richman*, JJ.

Concurring Opinion by Werdegar, J.

-- joined by Rivera, J.**

*Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

**Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Fourth, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

S165549

KLEIN (ALAN RICHARD) v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Opinion filed

In response to the Ninth Circuit's request for clarification of California law, we conclude that Civil Code section 846 does not shield a landowner from liability to a recreational user for personal injury resulting from the negligent driving of the landowner's employee acting within the course and scope of employment.

Majority Opinion by Kennard, J.

-- joined by George, C. J., Werdegar, and Moreno, JJ.

Dissenting Opinion by Baxter, J.

-- joined by Chin and Corrigan, JJ.

S047868

PEOPLE v. GEORGE (JOHNATON SAMPSON)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Bruce Eric Cohen's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief by June 1, 2011, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to September 20, 2010. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 250 additional days are contemplated.

S096438

CARTER (TRACEY LAVELL) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Ronald S. Smith's representation that he anticipates filing the traverse to the return to the order to show cause by January 11, 2011, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to September 20, 2010. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days are contemplated.

S098318

PEOPLE v. HENDERSON (PAUL NATHAN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Martin H. Dodd's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by November 2010, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to September 24, 2010. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 60 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S103358

PEOPLE v. BARRERA (MARCO ESQUIVEL)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy State Public Defender Ellen J. Eggers's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by December 1, 2011, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to October 1, 2010. After that date, only seven further extensions totaling about 420 additional days are contemplated.

S180567 G040808 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

PEOPLE v. SKILES (DANNY LEE)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief on the merits is extended to August 27, 2010.

No further extension of time will be contemplated.

S180612 H034154 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. BARRETT (CHRISTINE)

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to August 30, 2010.

BAR MISC. 4186 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS (MOTION NO. 933)

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED.)